

E-Filing

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

INFORMATICA CORPORATION, a  
Delaware Corporation,

No. C 02-3378 JSW

Plaintiffs,

v.

**CLAIMS CONSTRUCTION  
ORDER**

BUSINESS OBJECTS DATA  
INTEGRATION, INC., formerly known as  
ACTA TECHNOLOGY, INC., a Delaware  
Corporation,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_  
AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.  
\_\_\_\_\_

The Court has been presented with a technology tutorial and briefing leading up to a hearing pursuant to *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996). This Order construes the ten claim terms selected by the parties, which appear in the four patents at issue in this case, United States Patent Nos. 6,014,670 ("the '670 patent") and 6,339,775 B1 ("the '775 patent"), both entitled "Apparatus and Method for Performing Data Transformations in Data Warehousing," United States Patent No. 6,208,990 B1 ("the '990 patent") entitled "Method and Architecture For Automated Optimization of ETL Throughput in Data Warehousing Applications," and United States Patent No. 6,044,374 ("the '374 patent") entitled "Method and Apparatus for Sharing Metadata Between Multiple Data Marts Through Object References."

**BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff Informatica Corporation and defendant Business Objects Data Integration, Inc. ("BODI"), formerly known as Acta Technology, Inc., are competitors in the field of business analytics software, which enables enterprises to automate integration, analysis and delivery of key data. Informatica designs and markets software that enables its customers to transform and update data within various data warehouses and data marts, and to share data among enterprise constituencies. BODI designs and markets a real-time data integration platform that intelligently manages and optimizes the performance of an enterprise's data infrastructure.

On July 15, 2002, Informatica filed this suit alleging infringement of three of the patents-in-suit by defendant BODI. Informatica subsequently amended the complaint and added a claim for infringement of the fourth patent-in-suit. BODI answered the first amended complaint and denied infringement of the patents-in-suit. BODI additionally asserted counterclaims of patent invalidity, unenforceability, and non-infringement. Pursuant to a stipulation reached between the parties, BODI later filed an amended answer and counterclaims, which added counterclaims for unenforceability of the patents-in-suit due to inequitable conduct before the Patent and Trademark Office during the patent prosecution.

There are four patents at issue in this case. The first two, the '670 patent and the '775<sup>1</sup> patent, claim an apparatus and method for transforming data in data warehousing applications. The patents additionally disclose a functional specification for a transformation description language, which describes how data is to be manipulated in a data warehousing application. The parties agree that a data warehousing application is software that extracts, transforms and loads data into one or more databases, where the data is useful for decision support, usually across an enterprise. The '990 patent pertains to an apparatus and method for automating optimal throughput of the data extraction/transformation/loading ("ETL") process in data warehousing applications. Finally, the '374 patent relates to a method and apparatus for sharing metadata between multiple data marts through the use of object references. Metadata is data

---

<sup>1</sup> The '775 is a continuation-in-part of and claims the benefit of application Ser. No. 08/966,449, which designated the '670 patent.

1 about data. Again, the parties agree that a data mart application is software that extracts,  
 2 transforms and loads data into one or more databases, where the database(s) contain a subset of  
 3 corporate data useful for decision support of an aspect of a business. Informatica is the sole  
 4 assignee of all four patents-in-suit.

## 5 ANALYSIS

### 6 A. Legal Standard

7 “It is a bedrock principle of patent law that the claims of a patent define the invention to  
 8 which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude.” *Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water*  
 9 *Filtration Sys., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The interpretation of the scope and  
 10 meaning of disputed terms in patent claims is a question of law and exclusively within the  
 11 province of the court to decide. *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370, 372  
 12 (1996). The inquiry into the meaning of the claim terms is “an objective one.” *Innova/Pure*  
 13 *Water, Inc.*, 381 F.3d at 1116. As a result, a court undertaking the construction of disputed  
 14 terms “looks to sources available to the public that show what a person of skill in the art would  
 15 have understood the disputed claim language to mean.” *Id.* In most cases, the court’s analysis  
 16 will focus on three sources: the claims, the specification, and the prosecution history. *Markman*  
 17 *v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 979 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff’d*, 517 U.S. 370,  
 18 372 (1996). However, on occasion reliance on extrinsic evidence regarding the relevant  
 19 scientific principles, the meaning of technical terms, and the state of the art at the time at the  
 20 time the patent issued is appropriate.

21 The starting point of the claim construction analysis is an examination of the specific  
 22 claim language. “[T]he analytical focus must begin and remain centered on the language of the  
 23 claims themselves, for it is that language that the patentee chose to use to particularly point out  
 24 and distinctly claim the subject matter which the patentee regards as his invention.”  
 25 *Innova/Pure Water, Inc.*, 381 F.3d at 1116 (internal quotations and citations omitted). Indeed,  
 26 in the absence of an express intent to impart a novel meaning to a term, an inventor’s chosen  
 27 language is given its ordinary meaning. *York Prods., Inc. v. Cent. Tractor Farm & Family*  
 28 *Center*, 99 F.3d 1568, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *see also Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.*,

1 327 F.3d 1364, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (“Claim language generally carries the ordinary meaning  
2 of the words in their normal usage in the field of invention.”). The terms used within a claim  
3 bear “a ‘heavy presumption’ that they mean what they say and have the ordinary meaning that  
4 would be attributed to those words by persons skilled in the relevant art.” *Texas Digital Sys.,*  
5 *Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1193, 1202 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *see also Renishaw PLC v.*  
6 *Marposs Societa’ per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1248 (Fed Cir. 1998) (recognizing that “the claims  
7 define the scope of the right to exclude; the claim construction inquiry, therefore, begins and  
8 ends in all cases with the actual words of the claim”). The court’s final construction, therefore,  
9 must accord with the words chosen by the patentee to mete out the boundaries of claimed  
10 invention.

11 The court should also look to intrinsic evidence, including the written description, the  
12 drawings, and the prosecution history, if included in the record, to provide context and  
13 clarification regarding the intended meaning of the claim terms. *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am.*  
14 *Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1324-25 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The claims do not stand alone, rather, “they are  
15 part of ‘a fully integrated written instrument.’” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, Nos. 03-1269, 03-1286,  
16 \_\_ F.3d \_\_, 2005 WL 1620331, \*15 (Fed. Cir. July 12, 2005) (en banc) (quoting *Markman*, 52  
17 F.2d at 978). The specification “may act as a sort of dictionary, which explains the invention  
18 and may define the terms used in the claims.” *Markman*, 52 F.3d at 979-80. The specification  
19 can also indicate whether the patentee intended to limit the scope of a claim, despite the use of  
20 seemingly broad claim language. *SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.*,  
21 242 F.3d 1337, 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (recognizing that when the specification “makes clear that  
22 the invention does not include a particular feature, that feature is deemed to be outside the reach  
23 of the claims of the patent, even though the language of the claims, read without reference to the  
24 specification, might be considered broad enough to encompass the feature in question”).

25 Intent to limit the claims can be demonstrated in a number of ways. For example, if the  
26 patentee “acted as his own lexicographer,” and clearly and precisely set forth a definition of the  
27 disputed term in either the specification or the prosecution history, the court will defer to that  
28 definition. *CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 288 F.3d 1359, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2002). All

1 that is required to so limit the claims is for the patentee to set out the alternative meaning in the  
2 specification “in a manner sufficient to give one of ordinary skill in the art notice of the change  
3 from the ordinary meaning.” *Innova/Pure Water, Inc.*, 381 F.3d at 1117. In addition, the court  
4 will adopt an alternative meaning of a term “if the intrinsic evidence shows that the patentee  
5 distinguished that term from prior art on the basis of a particular embodiment, expressly  
6 disclaimed subject matter, or described a particular embodiment as important to the invention.”  
7 *CCS Fitness, Inc.*, 288 F.3d at 1367. Likewise, the specification may be used to resolve  
8 ambiguity “where the ordinary and accustomed meaning of the words used in the claims lack  
9 sufficient clarity to permit the scope of the claim to be ascertained from the words alone.”  
10 *Teleflex*, 299 F.3d at 1325.

11 However, limitations from the specification (such as from the preferred embodiment)  
12 may not be read into the claims, absent the inventor’s express intention to the contrary. *Id.* at  
13 1326; *see also CCS Fitness*, 288 F.3d at 1366 (“[A] patentee need not describe in the  
14 specification every conceivable and possible future embodiment of his invention.”); *Virginia*  
15 *Panel Corp. v. MAC Panel Co.*, 133 F.3d 860, 866 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“[I]t is well-settled that  
16 device claims are not limited to devices which operate precisely as the embodiments described  
17 in detail in the patent.”). To protect against this result, the court’s focus should remain on  
18 understanding how a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the claim terms.  
19 *Phillips*, 2005 WL 1620331, at \*15.

20 If the analysis of the intrinsic evidence fails to resolve any ambiguity in the claim  
21 language, the court may then turn to extrinsic evidence, such as expert declarations and  
22 testimony from the inventors. *Intel Corp. v. VIA Techs., Inc.*, 319 F.3d 1357, 1367 (Fed. Cir.  
23 2003) (“When an analysis of intrinsic evidence resolves any ambiguity in a disputed claim term,  
24 it is improper to rely on extrinsic evidence to contradict the meaning so ascertained.”). When  
25 considering extrinsic evidence, the court should take care not to use it to vary or contradict the  
26 claim terms. Rather, extrinsic evidence is more appropriately relied upon to assist in  
27 determining the meaning or scope of technical terms in the claims. *Vitronics Corp. v.*  
28 *Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Dictionaries also may play a role in the determination of the ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term. The Federal Circuit recently reiterated that “[d]ictionaries or comparable sources are often useful to assist in understanding commonly understood meanings of words . . . .” *Phillips*, 2005 WL 1620331, at \*15. But the *Phillips* court admonished that district courts should be careful not to allow dictionary definitions to supplant the inventor’s understanding of the claimed subject matter. “The main problem with elevating the dictionary to . . . prominence is that it focuses the inquiry on the abstract meaning of the words rather than on the meaning of the claim terms within in the context of the patent.” *Id.* at \* 14. Accordingly, dictionaries necessarily must play a role subordinate to the intrinsic evidence.

## **B. Claim Construction**

### **The ‘670 and ‘775 Patents**

The ‘775 patent is a continuation-in-part of and claims the benefit of application Ser. No. 08/966,449, which designated the ‘670 patent. The specifications for the ‘670 and ‘775 patents are essentially identical.

#### **1. “port”**

The term “port” appears in numerous claims of the ‘670 patent (claims 1-7, 9-11, 18-19, 21-23, 30-34, 36-37, 40-42, 46, 51). Informatica asserts that the plain meaning of the term is understood by those in art and proposes the term be construed to mean “An abstraction for describing the inputs and/or outputs of sources, targets or transformation objects.” BODI offers the construction:

A port is analogous to a column of a table and provides the primary means of parameterized dataflow between various objects in a mapping. A port must have a name, data type it holds, and its data flow type (*i.e.*, in, out, or in/out). A port must always be defined within the definition of a source, target, or transformation object; thus it would be meaningless to have a stand-alone definition of a port. Ports provide the means for transferring data between sources, targets, and transformation objects.

A port has the following specification:

```
<port_def>::=<port_name><data_type_def><port_type>
<port_name>::=<string>
<port_type>::=|IN|OUT|INOUT|

<data_type_def>::=<data_type>[(<precision>[,<scale>])]
<precision>::=<integer>
<scale>::=<integer>
```



1  
2 BODI asserts that the term port has no generally accepted meaning within the industry;  
3 accordingly, it refers the Court to the patent specification and pulls its proposed construction  
4 from this source. Informatica responds that BODI's proposed construction impermissibly  
5 imports a limitation from the specification into the claims. Moreover, Informatica asserts that  
6 the patent as a whole claims an apparatus and method for performing data transformations in  
7 data warehousing; the functional specification for a transformation description language  
8 ("TDL") – the basis for BODI's construction – is merely a preferred embodiment disclosed in  
9 the specification.

10 Claim construction requires courts to walk the fine line between interpreting the claims  
11 in light of the specification, *Markman*, 52 F.3d at 979, and impermissibly reading a limitation  
12 into the claim from the specification, *Comark Communications, Inc. v. Harris Corp.*, 156 F.3d  
13 1182, 1186-87 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The balance may be found by determining how the  
14 specification characterizes the claimed invention. In other words, does the specification discuss  
15 a limitation only as part of some of the possible embodiments or does the specification read as a  
16 whole imply that "the very character of the invention requires the limitation be a part of every  
17 embodiment." *Alloc, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 342 F.3d 1361, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *cert.*  
18 *denied*, 124 S. Ct. 2390 (2004); *see also Nazomi Communications, Inc. v. ARM Holdings, PLC*,  
19 403 F.3d 1364, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (discussing that claims may embrace "different subject  
20 matter than is illustrated in the specific embodiments in the specification").

21 The written description of the '670 patent focuses almost exclusively on the TDL  
22 process, thereby lending support to BODI's argument. Nevertheless, the specification does not  
23 state that TDL is the actual invention, rather it recites that TDL, in the context of the preferred  
24 embodiment, is the process created for describing the data definitions, manipulations, and other  
25 types of transformations in the data warehousing domain. The Federal Circuit has instructed  
26 that even in cases where the specification describes only one embodiment, that embodiment  
27 only rarely limits the scope of the claim term. *See, e.g., Innova/Pure Water, Inc.*, 381 F.3d at  
28 1117 (stating that "even where a patent describes only a single embodiment, claims will not be

1 read restrictively unless the patentee has demonstrated a clear intention to limit the claim scope  
2 using words or expressions of manifest exclusion or restriction" (internal quotation omitted));  
3 *SRI Int'l v. Matsushita Elec. Corp of Am.*, 775 F.2d 1107, 1121 n. 14 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ("That a  
4 specification describes only one embodiment does not require that each claim be limited to that  
5 one embodiment."). It is the claims that measure the invention, not the specification.

6 *Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve, Inc.*, 256 F.3d 1323, 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("In  
7 construing claims, the analytical focus must begin and remain centered on the language of the  
8 claims themselves, for it is that language that the patentee chose to particularly point out and  
9 distinctively claim the subject matter which the patentee regards as his invention." (internal  
10 quotation omitted). The specification here does not contain any statements of limitation or  
11 disclaimers that limit the definition of port to something other than the plain meaning.

12 The doctrine of claim differentiation also undermines BODI's proposed construction.  
13 The Federal Circuit has recognized that, while not a hard and fast rule of construction, the  
14 doctrine of claim differentiation creates a presumption that each claim in a patent has a different  
15 scope. *Comark Communications*, 156 F.3d at 1187. This presumption "is especially strong  
16 when the limitation in dispute is the only meaningful difference between an independent and  
17 dependent claim, and one party is urging that the limitation in the dependent claim should be  
18 read into the independent claim. *Sunrace Roots Enters. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298,  
19 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Normally, "limitations stated in dependent claims are not to be read into  
20 the independent claims from which they depend." *Karlin Tech., Inc. v. Surgical Dynamics, Inc.*,  
21 177 F.3d 968, 972 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

22 A review of all the claims at issue, supports the conclusion that BODI's proposed  
23 construction is untenable. Dependent claim 19 adds to independent claim 18 only the clause:  
24 "wherein the ports are comprised of a name, a data file, and a flow type." Similarly, dependent  
25 claim 36 adds to independent claim 30 only the clause: "wherein the ports are comprised of a  
26 name, a data file, and a flow type." The juxtaposition of the independent claims lacking any  
27 reference to name, data file, and flow type with the dependent claims that add this limitation  
28 provides strong support for Informatica's argument that the independent claims were not



intended to require the presence of the details contained in BODI's construction. Adopting BODI's proposed construction would import the nuances of the dependent claims into the independent claims; the dependent claims thereby would be rendered entirely redundant. BODI has not come forward with a persuasive argument to rebut the presumption that the independent claims should not be so limited as to render the dependent claims superfluous.

The Court adopts Informatica's proposed construction and construes the term "port" to mean: **An abstraction for describing the inputs and/or outputs of sources, targets or transformation objects.**

## 2. "transformation object"

The term "transformation object" appears in numerous claims of the '670 patent (claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-35, 38-39) and three claims of the '775 patent (claims 1, 9, 11). Informatica points to the plain meaning of the term, as understood by one skilled in the art, and proposes the term be construed to mean "A reusable component for processing data according to predefined instructions." BODI proffers the construction "A transformation object is an object which transforms (*i.e.*, modifies) data according to some predefined behavior or rule. An object has two parts. The first part has a declaration for the ports and attributes of the object, and the second part has a definition of the behavior of the object. A transformation object has input and output ports. Different transformation objects perform different, unique functions, and are selected according to the functions which need to be performed in order to generate the desired transformations."

As with the previous term, BODI advocates for a narrow construction of this term and relies on language in the intrinsic record. None of the indicia of a patentee's intent to limit the claims is present here. The intrinsic record provides no indication that the patentee acted as its own lexicographer during the prosecution and explicitly defined the term "transformation objects" to differ from its otherwise ordinary meaning. *CCS Fitness*, 288 F.3d at 1366. Nor is there any evidence before the Court establishing that the patentee distinguished this term from prior art on the basis of a particular embodiment or expressly disclaimed subject matter. *Id.* Finally, as discussed above, the specification does not state that TDL is the actual invention,

nor is there any clear and unmistakeable disavowal of the claim scope. "Absent a clear disclaimer of particular subject matter, the fact that the inventor may have anticipated that the invention would be used in a particular way does not mean that the scope of the invention is limited to that context." *Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 898, 909 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (internal quotation omitted). The Court declines to limit the claim to the preferred embodiment disclosed in the specification.

The Court adopts Informatica's proposed construction and construes the phrase "transformation object" to mean: **A reusable component for processing data according to predefined instructions.**

### 3. "sequence transformation object"

The term "sequence transformation object" appears in three claims of the '670 patent (claims 13, 25, 39) and three claims of the '775 patent (claims 1, 9, 11). Information proposes the term be construed as "A transformation object that generates keys from an initial value."

BODI proposes the term be construed as:

A transformation object that is used for creating unique keys for records as they are processed in a mapping. Each instance of a sequence transformation is created with an initial value, which is used at the start of an execution, an increment value to compute the values of subsequent indexes, and an end value. Default values will be used if any of these parameters are omitted. This transformation has two predefined output ports, curval and nextval, that contain the current value and the next value of the sequence index, respectively.

A sequence has the following specification:

```
CREATE Sequence <sequence_name> (
    curval INTEGER OUT,
    nextval INTEGER OUT,
    [Startvalue [<integer>] ATTR,]
    [Increment [<integer>] ATTR,]
    [Endval [<integer>] ATTR,]
    [Cycle [<boolean>] ATTR,]
    [Cache [<boolean>] ATTR,]
    [Reset [<boolean>] ATTR,]
)
```

Once again, BODI's proposed construction comes directly from the specification of the '670 and '775 patents, and the parties present essentially the same arguments regarding the appropriate use of the limitations disclosed in the specification. For the reasons stated above, the Court declines to import those limitations into the claim language. The Court adopts

1 Informatica's proposed construction and construes the phrase "sequence transformation object"  
2 to mean: **A transformation object that generates unique keys from an initial value.**

3  
4 **The '990 Patent**

5 **4. "transformation component"**

6 The term "transformation component" appears in several claims of the '990 patent  
7 (claims 1-7, 9-15). Informatica contends that the term "transformation component" is  
8 synonymous with the previously defined "transformation object," from the '670 and '775  
9 patents, and thus proposes the two terms be construed to have the same meaning. Informatica,  
10 proposes: "A reusable component for processing data according to predefined instructions."  
11 BODI proposes: "A transformation component is the same as a transformation object, which is a  
12 software binary file acting as an individual unit that possesses built-in autonomy and  
13 encapsulates the functionalities of a transformation. The autonomy of each transformation  
14 software component is manifested in two dimensions. The first dimension of component  
15 autonomy relates to how each transformation component implements staging (storing) the  
16 incoming data fields as it processes these data fields. The second dimension of component  
17 autonomy relates to how each transformation component automatically selects its own mode of  
18 manipulating data input/output. Each transformation component either pushes data to another  
19 transformation component, or performs a push/pull operation on the data."

20 The Detailed Description of the '990 patent specifically states that "[i]n the following  
21 detailed description of the present invention, some of the interchangeable key terms relating to  
22 the present invention are collected and defined in the section below to resolve possible  
23 ambiguity and to facilitate future reference." The precise term at issue here is listed  
24 immediately below this statement. "A transformation component is the same as a  
25 transformation object, which is a software binary file acting as an individual unit that possesses  
26 built-in autonomy and encapsulates the functionalities of a transformation." These statements  
27 evince the patentee's intention to depart from the ordinary meaning of transformation  
28 component. The introductory language makes clear that it is discussing the components of

“present invention.” The statements in the specification about the meaning of a transformation component are not merely exemplary, rather they define the patentee’s understanding and use of the term transformation component in light of the claimed invention. “Because the inquiry into the meaning of claim terms is an objective one, a patentee who notifies the public that claim terms are to be limited beyond their ordinary meaning to one of skill in the art will be bound by that notification, even where it may have been unintended.” *Innova/Pure Water, Inc.*, 381 F.3d at 1117; *see also Watts v. XL Sys., Inc.*, 232 F.3d 877, 883 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (concluding that the written description limits the invention by “stating that ‘the present invention utilizes [the] feature’”).

The Court concludes that the Detailed Description includes a clear lexicographic definition, and accordingly construes the phrase “transformation component” to mean: **A transformation component is the same as a transformation object, which is a software binary file acting as an individual unit that possesses built-in autonomy and encapsulates the functionalities of a transformation.**

**5. “staging data in a first said plurality of transformation components”**

The phrase “staging data in a first said plurality of transformation components” appears in claim one of the ‘990 patent. Claim one reads (with the disputed phrase in bold):

1. A computer implemented method for transforming data in a data warehousing application, comprising the steps of:
  - specifying at least one source containing data;
  - constructing a plurality of transformation components for manipulating data according to pre-determined sets of rules;
  - coupling the transformation components to form one or more pipelines;
  - specifying a target for storing data generated by one or more of the pipelines;
  - staging data in a first of said plurality of transformation components;** and
  - streaming data in a second of said plurality of transformation components, wherein said staging and said streaming of data are performed automatically by software without human intervention.

Informatica proposes the definition “In a first transformation component, storing some amount of incoming data for processing.” BODI proposes the construction “Staging data is the storing of incoming data fields as the transformation component processes the data fields. The degree of requisite staging by each transformation component is automatically determined and

1 implemented, without any human intervention. Depending on the nature of the transformation,  
2 each transformation component will automatically select the optimal amount of staging. The  
3 staging can range continuously from zero staging (also known as streaming) to full staging.”

4 Informatica contends that the term “staging” when used in the context of data is  
5 generally understood in the field to mean storing data prior to processing. Further, Informatica  
6 maintains that the patent sets out that staging can range continuously from zero, which is  
7 referred to as streaming, to full staging. Therefore, staging involves storing some amount of  
8 incoming data. BODI derives its proposed construction from the Summary of the Invention  
9 section of the specification. The complete text surrounding the language BODI urges states  
10 (with the BODI’s proposal in bold):

11 The autonomy of each transformation software component is manifested  
12 in two dimensions: The first dimension of a component autonomy relates to how  
13 each transformation component implements staging (storing) **the incoming data**  
14 **fields as it processes these data fields. The degree of requisite staging by each**  
15 **transformation component is automatically determined and implemented, without**  
16 **any human intervention. Depending on the nature of the transformation, each**  
17 **transformation component will automatically select the optimal amount of staging.**  
18 **The staging range continuously from zero staging (also known as streaming) to full**  
19 **staging.** A transformation with zero staging is called streaming transformation. The  
20 second dimension of component autonomy relates to how each transformation  
21 component automatically selects its own mode of manipulating data input/output.  
22 Depending on the nature of the transformation, each transformation component, together  
23 with the server, automatically selects a push mode, a pull mode, or a push and pull mode  
24 that optimizes throughput.

25 Informatica posits that BODI’s construction is incorrect for two primary reasons. First,  
26 the portion of the specification upon which BODI relies is discussing only a preferred  
27 embodiment. Second, the proposed construction reads into this term specific features that are  
28 included separately in the claim language, namely that the requisite degree of staging of data is  
performed automatically by software without human intervention. The Court agrees that  
BODI’s construction results in redundancy in the claim language and renders portions of the  
remaining claim language superfluous. Claim one explicitly teaches that “staging and said  
streaming of data are performed automatically by software without human intervention.” It is  
unlikely that the patentee contemplated that the phrase “staging data in a first said plurality of  
transformation components,” appearing earlier in the same claim, also contained that feature.  
Indeed the additional text would be unnecessary if persons of skill in the art understood that



1 staging data in a first said plurality of transformation components inherently serve such a  
2 function.

3  
4 The Court adopts Informatica's proposed construction and construes the phrase to mean:  
5 **In a first transformation component, storing some amount of incoming data for**  
6 **processing.**

7 **The '374 Patent**

8 There are five terms at issue in the '374 patent. All five terms appear, *intra alia*, in  
9 claim one, which reads (with the disputed terms in bold):

10 1. A database system for storing database system for storing data, comprising:

11 a **global repository** containing metadata;  
12 a **shared folder** residing in the **global repository**, wherein the **shared folder** contains  
13 metadata which is to be shared;  
14 a **first data mart linked to the global repository**;  
15 a **reference** residing within the **first data mart**, wherein the **reference** specifies a **link** to  
16 of [sic] the metadata in the **shared folder of the global repository** and a user accesses  
17 the metadata through the **first data mart** by using the **reference** to read the metadata  
18 residing in the **shared folder**.

19 6. **"data mart"**

20 The term "data mart" appears in several claims of the '374 patent (claims 1-5, 7-12).  
21 Informatica proposes the construction "Software that extracts, transforms and loads data into  
22 one or more databases, where the database(s) contain a subset of corporate data useful for  
23 decision support for an aspect of a business." BODI proposes the construction "An analytical  
24 database containing a subset of corporate information useful for decision support for an aspect  
25 of a business."

26 The crux of the parties' dispute is whether a data mart in the context of the '374 patent is  
27 limited to a passive database or incorporates both the end product target database and the  
28 associated metadata and applications used to build and maintain a data mart database, i.e. a data  
29 mart environment. Informatica posits that the term data mart and the term data mart application<sup>2</sup>

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

<sup>2</sup> The parties previously reached an agreement regarding the construction of data mart application. They agree that a data mart application is software that extracts, transforms and loads data into one or more databases, where the database(s) contain a subset of corporate

1 should be construed similarly. The Court finds that there is no support in the patent for this  
2 proposition and declines to adopt Informatica's proposal. In addition, while the Court is  
3 mindful that the patent as a whole teaches a "method and system for accessing and sharing  
4 metadata amongst a number of data marts through the use of object referencing," neither the  
5 specification nor the claims describe data marts as having software functionality.

6 The specification states that a "data warehouse is comprised of an analytical database  
7 containing information useful for decision support." "Data marts are similar to data  
8 warehouses, except that data marts usually contain only a subset of corporate data which is  
9 directed towards a singles aspect of that business (e.g., a separate finance data mart, sales data  
10 mart, human resources data mart, etc.)." BODI's proposed construction combines these two  
11 concepts and moreover, comports with the ordinary meaning as understood by one skilled in the  
12 art.

13 The Court adopts BODI's construction and construes the phrase "data mart" to mean:  
14 **An analytical database containing a subset of corporate information useful for decision**  
15 **support for an aspect of a business.**

16 **7. "global repository"**

17 The term "global repository" appears in claims one through five of the '374 patent.  
18 Informatica proposes the construction "An abstraction for a database that stores metadata that is  
19 also accessible from one or more local database repositories."<sup>3</sup> BODI proposes the construction  
20 "A repository is an abstraction for a database where metadata is stored. There are three types of  
21 repositories: independent, linked, and global. A global repository is distinguished from  
22 independent and linked repositories in that it is the only repository which stores metadata that  
23 can be shared with other linked repositories." The parties agree that the general meaning of the  
24 term "repository" is "an abstraction for a database," as set forth in the specification.

25  
26  
27 data useful for decision support of an aspect of a business.

28 <sup>3</sup> Informatica indicated in its opening brief that it does not object to the use of BODI's  
synonymous "linked repositories" language in lieu of "local database repositories."

1 The parties proffer similar constructions, but for BODI's proposed language regarding  
2 the three types of repositories, independent, linked, and global. The Court finds the term global  
3 repository can be construed without reference to and discussion of the other types of  
4 repositories. The Court construes the phrase "global repository" to mean: **An abstraction for a**  
5 **database that stores metadata that can be shared with other linked repositories.**

6 **8. "shared folder"**

7 The term "shared folder" appears in claims one and two of the '374 patent. Informatica  
8 proposes the construction: "A folder whose contents may be accessed through or by a local  
9 repository."<sup>4</sup> BODI proposes the construction "A folder represents the abstraction for grouping  
10 related objects and metadata in a repository. Folders can be of type regular or shared. The  
11 content of a shared folder can be accessed by other folders in the same repository, and by other  
12 linked repositories if the shared folder is in a global data mart repository through the use of a  
13 'reference.'"

14 Informatica argues that the term should be given its plain meaning. BODI counters that  
15 the term has no ordinary meaning in the art, and thus points the Court to the specification.  
16 Informatica's proffered construction is too broad and provides insufficient detail to be useful  
17 going forward. The specification and drawings contemplate that the term "folder" represents an  
18 abstraction for grouping related objects and metadata in a repository or data mart. There is no  
19 indication that this definition is limited to a preferred embodiment. At a minimum, the final  
20 construction should contain this statement.

21 BODI's proffered construction, on the other hand, is too narrow. The proposed  
22 construction reads in detail that is unnecessary to the definition of a "shared" folder, *i.e.* that  
23 folders can be either regular or shared. Further, the construction includes a specific feature that  
24 is addressed separately in the claim language, namely that the content of a shared folder in a  
25 global data mart repository can be accessed by other linked repositories. This feature in the  
26 claim language would be unnecessary if persons of skill in the art inherently understood that the  
27

---

28 <sup>4</sup> Again, Informatica indicated in its opening brief that it does not object to the use of  
BODI's "linked" modifier in lieu of its proposed modifier "local."

1 contents of a shared folder located in a global data mart repository could be accessed by other  
2 linked repositories. Moreover, the final construction can be structured to convey similar  
3 meaning to the term without reading in a limitation from the preferred embodiment.

4 The only remaining issue is whether the definition of "shared folder" must include the  
5 limitation that a reference is used to access the metadata in the shared folder. A review of the  
6 patent reveals that the invention was directed, in part, at a "method and system for accessing and  
7 sharing metadata amongst a number of data marts through the use of object referencing." The  
8 Summary of the Invention teaches that "[g]iven proper authorization, the metadata is accessed  
9 through the use of object referencing." Finally, the detailed description states that the "actual  
10 mechanism which allows for the sharing of metadata is through the use of 'object references.'"   
11 Thus, the specification teaches that the invention, as a whole (and not merely as a preferred  
12 embodiment), requires that the content stored in the shared folders is accessed through the use  
13 of a reference.

14 The Court construes the phrase "shared folder" to mean: **A folder represents the**  
15 **abstraction for grouping related objects and metadata in a repository. The contents of a**  
16 **shared folder may be accessed by other folders in the same repository and/or by other**  
17 **linked repositories through the use of a reference.**

18 **9. "reference"**

19 The term "reference" is found in four claims of the '374 patent (claims 1, 4, 7, 9).  
20 Informatica proposes the construction "A denotation of shareable metadata." BODI proposes  
21 the construction "Metadata is accessed through the use of an object reference, *i.e.*, a shortcut.  
22 Basically, a reference points to the object stored in the global repository. Rather than storing an  
23 object directly in each of the data marts desiring to access that particular object, a reference to  
24 that object is stored instead in those data marts. By using multiple references, the same object  
25 can be accessed, used, and shared by multiple users across many different data marts." Once  
26 again, Informatica's proposed construction is too vague and BODI's proposed construction is  
27 too narrow. The Court declines to adopt either construction.  
28

1 The patent discloses in several places throughout the specification that a reference is an  
2 abstraction for pointing to an object, which may be stored in various places. This definition is  
3 consistent with the use of the term in claims one, four, seven, and nine. The claims instruct that  
4 references residing in various data marts “specify a link to metadata in the shared folder,” or  
5 “point[] to the metadata residing within the global repository” or “specify a link to where the  
6 metadata is stored in [a particular] database.” Thus, in the context of the ‘374 patent, a  
7 reference is an abstraction for either denoting or pointing to the contents of a shared folder,  
8 which may reside in either the same repository or in the global data mart repository.

9 The Court construes the term “reference” to mean: **A reference represents an**  
10 **abstraction for pointing to the contents of a shared folder within the same repository or in**  
11 **the global data mart repository.**

12 **10. “link”**

13 The final term is “link,” which appears in claims one and seven of the ‘374 patent.”  
14 Informatica proposes that the term be construed to mean “connection.” BODI proposes the  
15 construction “A link is a connection between a reference in a data mart and specific metadata in  
16 a shared folder in a global repository. The linking enables those data marts the ability to gain  
17 access to the objects stored in the global repository.” Informatica argues that the term link has a  
18 plain and ordinary meaning, *i.e.*, a connection, that would be understood by one skilled in the  
19 art. BODI agrees that generally speaking a link is a connection, but in the context of the ‘374  
20 patent, connection is too generic and overly simplistic.

21 BODI’s proposed construction, requiring a link to connect a reference in a data mart and  
22 specific metadata in a global repository, fails to acknowledge the use of the term link in a  
23 broader sense in claim seven and throughout the specification. Claim seven discloses a method  
24 for sharing metadata between a plurality of databases, comprising, *intra alia*, a link between the  
25 second database and the first database. The Abstract and the Summary of the Invention discuss  
26 that “[a]ny number of data marts can be linked to the global repository.” Figure 2 depicts a  
27 global data mart repository “connected to a number of linked data marts” (as represented by the  
28 arrows pointing from the global data mart repository to the data marts). The description of



1 Figure 2 explains that “[b]y registering a repository with a [global data mart repository], the  
2 necessary link between the two repositories is established, and thereafter, the linked repository is  
3 able to share metadata with other repositories linked to the same [global data mart repository].”  
4 Finally, the detailed description states that the present invention provides for a sharing feature,  
5 which is “accomplished by linking certain designated data marts” with the global data mart  
6 repository.

7 When engaging in claim construction, the Court is bound by the presumption that “the  
8 same terms appearing in different portions of the claims should be given the same meaning  
9 unless it is clear from the specification and prosecution history that the terms have different  
10 meanings at different portions of the claims.” *Fin Control Sys. Pty, Ltd. v. OAM, Inc.*, 265 F.3d  
11 1311, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2001). BODI’s narrow construction of the term link is unworkable in  
12 light of the obvious broader use of the term throughout the patent.

13 There is no need to go beyond the plain and ordinary meaning here. The Court adopts  
14 Informatica’s proposed construction and construes the term “link” to mean: **Connection**.

#### 15 CONCLUSION

16 Based upon the analysis set forth above, the Court adopts the foregoing constructions of  
17 the disputed terms. The parties are ordered to submit a further joint case management report  
18 pursuant to Patent Standing Order ¶ 13 within 21 days of the filing of this Order.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20  
21 Dated: August 1, 2005

22   
23 JEFFREY S. WHITE  
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
25  
26  
27  
28